DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 467 CS 500 309

AUTHOR McCroskey, James C.; And Others
TITLE Measurement of the Credibility of Peers and Spouses.
PUB DATE Apr 73
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Communication Association (Montreal, April 25-29, 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; Attitude Tests; *Beliefs; *Measurement Techniques; Personality Tests; *Persuasive Discourse; Rating Scales; *Semantic Differential; Semantics; Values

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate the generalizability of source credibility scales across various types of sources and various types of subjects. Semantic differential scales from previous studies were used as an additional item pool for this study. Results of the work indicated that the factor structure for source credibility for spouses and peers varies from one subject sample to another. There are 25 pages of charts containing results. (CH)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 078467

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Measurement of the Credibility of Peers and Spouses

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James C. McCroskey
Thomas Jensen
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

James C. McCroskey - West Virginia University
Thomas Jensen - University of Utah
and
Cynthia Valencia - Illinois State University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Cynthia Valencia
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

ABSTRACT

Measurement of the Credibility of Peers and Spouses

This paper reports a portion of a series of investigations designed to determine generalizability of source credibility scales across various types of sources and various types of subjects. Semantic differential-scales that have been found to load on factors of source credibility in previous investigations were combined to provide an item pool for this study. Six groups of subjects were asked to respond to organization sources on the scales. Subjects included a random sample of adults in Peoria, Illinois, and college students in basic communication and speech classes at Illinois State University, the University of Utah, the University of Southern California, Hampton Institute, and Nihon University (Tokyo). Results of the investigation indicate the factor structure for source credibility for spouses and peers varies from one subject sample to another. The implications of this variability for research on source credibility are discussed and suggestions are provided for researchers concerned with this variable.

Paper presented at International Communication Association Convention
Montreal, Quebec
April, 1973

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to express their appreciation to several colleagues who provided invaluable assistance in the collection of the data for this study: to Patrick McDermott (Utah) who provided the data from the University of Utah, to Michael Scott (USC) who collected the Southern California data, to Jeff Mutnick (Hampton Institute) who collected the Hampton Institute data, to Donald Klopf (University of Hawaii) and Takehide Kawashima (Nihon University) who collected the Japanese data, and to 18 graduate assistants at Illinois State University in 1971-72 who interviewed the subjects in the Peoria sample. Without the many hours of effort expended by these people, this study would not have been possible.

CS 500 309

Measurement of the Credibility of Peers and Spouses

Whether source credibility is an important variable in persuasion is no longer a real question. An extensive body of literature has developed over the past two decades indicating that source credibility may be the single most important variable in determining persuasive effects of communication. Researchers in the area of persuasion have become increasingly aware that source credibility must be controlled and/or measured in persuasion studies in order to account for either main effects of credibility, interaction effects of credibility, or contamination due to the credibility variable. Similarly, source credibility as a terminal effect of persuasion has received increasing attention from researchers in the field.

This increased recognition of the importance of source credibility in research on persuasive communication has created a demand for measuring instruments which can reliably tap the credibility variable. Two sets of scales have been the predominate choice of researchers in the field of speech communication. These are the scales developed by McCroskey (1966) and by Berlo, Lemert, and Mertz (1969). Use of either of these scales presumes the multi-dimensionality of the source credibility construct. Both sets were developed utilizing the methodology of factor analysis. Both include dimensions concerning the competence and the character of the communication source. In addition, the Berlo instrument includes scales to measure the dimension of dynamism. The Berlo instrument employs the semantic differential approach to measurement. While McCroskey reported both Likert-type and semantic differential-type scales, the semantic differential-type scales have been predominantly the ones chosen for use.

These two sets of scales are virtually identical in both their development and in the scales themselves, with the exception of dynamism being present in the Berlo instrument. The only important difference in the development of the scales is that one (McCroskey) was based on research with undergraduate students while the other (Berlo) was based on a sample of adults in the Lansing, Michigan area. The development of both sets of scales was predicated upon subjects' responses to public figures. Since the scales are so similar and were based on two different subject populations, many people have assumed that these scales are highly generalizable and, as a result, have used them to measure many types of communication sources.

Tucker (1971) has noted the error in assuming that these scales are universal. He notes that varying subject-type or source-type may cause the dimensionality of source credibility scales to change. McCroskey, Scott, and Young (1971) provide a direct test of the generalizability of these scales. Their results indicated that the use of either of these sets of scales to measure the credibility of sources who were either spouses or peers, when the research subjects were adults, would be undefendable. They also found that scales developed by Norman (1963), Markham (1968), and Whitehead (1968) did not generalize to sources of this type. It is clear from the Tucker critque and the McCroskey, Scott, and Young research that researchers concerned with source credibility should be advised to factor analyze their source credibility scales prior to their use as either dependent or independent variables. Unfortunately, that

advice is much easier to give, under some circumstances, than it is to follow. Several writers concerned with factor analysis suggest that there is a need for at least 200 subjects for a factor analysis to be justified (Guilford, 1954). It is very common to find studies concerned with source credibility that do not have this size of sample. In addition, many studies include only a single source. Factor analysis of data provided by subjects all responding to the same source is of very questionable value. Unless there is considerable variability in the subject population, the resulting factor structure may be quite meaningless, as in the case of the Whitehead (1968) and Baudhuin and Davis (1973) studies.

An alternative to the "factor analyze everytime" advice is a series of investigations designed to determine just how far credibility scales can be generalized. The current paper is a report of a portion of such a series of investigations. This series of studies assumes that three elements may contribute to a lack of generalizability of factor structures and source credibility measuring instruments. The first, and most obvious, element which may contribute to the lack of generalizability is the scales employed. The major factor analytic studies concerning credibility have all used different item pools. Consequently, the obtained differences in factor structures could be simply a function of the difference in items employed. The second element that may contribute to the lack of generalizability is differences in research subjects. With the exception of the research by Berlo (1969), the research subjects in all of the major factor-analytic investigations have been college students, more specifically, white college students. Even the novice behaviorist in communication soon learns how questionable it is to generalize from college students to an adult population. But beyond that, within either a student population or an adult population there are many sub-cultural groupings. To employ predominately white college students as subjects and then to generalize even to college students as a whole is dangerous. There has been no research examining non-white groups within our society and their responses in terms of source credibility dimensions.

The third and possibly the most important element which may contribute to the lack of generalizability of source credibility instruments is differences in source-type. Do we respond on the psychological dimensions to all types of sources? The research reported by McCroskey, Scott, and Young (1971) indicates that we may not. The subjects in their study responded to peers on four dimensions while responding to spouses on six dimensions. It would appear, therefore, that if we are to obtain source credibility measuring instruments which have any generalizability at all, these instruments must be based upon specific source-types. The current series of investigations is involved with the following categories of source-type: public figures, peers, spouses, mass media, organization sources, teachers, superiors in an organization, subordinates in an organization, and members of a small task group. Other categories of source-type may be added later as the need becomes apparent. The present report is concerned with source-types seldom considered in previous investigations--peers and spouses.

Of equal and possibly greater importance than the question of factor structure is the question of factor importance. Just because a given dimension appears in a number of factor analytic studies, this does not mean that that dimension has any social utility. The primary reason for the

development of measures of source credibility is so that researchers may use measures of credibility to predict variance in communication or other behavior. Consequently, the current series of investigations took additional measures relating to potential communication behavior and responses to communication behavior from each subject for each source. The data were then analyzed to determine the ability of obtained credibility dimensions to predict these variables.

Method.

The current investigation employed as its initial item pool 53 semantic differential-type scales representing the dimensions of source credibility reported by Norman (1963), McCroskey (1966), Markham (1968), Whitehead (1968), and Berlo, Lemert, and Mertz (1969). All of the scales with high loadings on given factors in these studies were included, but because of several duplications of items, the item pool was reduced to 53. After the pilot phase of this study (McCroskey, Scott and Young, 1971) 11 items in the original data pool were omitted. The first phase of the study involved four source-types. The 11 items omitted failed to have satisfactory factor loadings on any factor for any source-type. Four additional items were added to the item pool after the pilot investigation. These items were added for the purpose of strengthening obtained factors in the first investigation that appeared to be clear dimensions of response but which had only 2 or 3 items with satisfactory loadings. Therefore, the item pool was composed of 46 semantic differential-type scales. (See Appendix A)

Measures of potential communication behavior and response to communication behavior were nine Likert-type statements with response options falling on an eleven-step continuum bound by bipolar adjectives. (See Appendix A)

Sources.

The two source-types employed in this study were "peers" and "spouses." The "peer" classification was operationalized by instructing the subjects to complete the scales for "other than a member of your family, the person you talked with last." The subjects were further instructed not to consider the interviewer as the person talked to last. As a means of checking this operationalization against its conceptual counterpart, 38 student subjects were asked to follow the above instruction. After they had completed the task they were asked to respond to the following question: "Would you consider the person you filled out the questionnaire about a peer of yours?" The obtained response was 35 "yes," 1 "no," and 2 "undecided." Consequently, it was decided that this operationalization was sufficiently isomorphic with the peer conceptualization to be useful for the present purpose.

The "spouse" classification was operationalized by instructing the subjects to complete the scales for "your spouse." "Spouse" was defined as "your wife or husband, former wife or husband, the person to whom you are engaged or with whom you are dating regularly." People with no spouse or "spouse equivalent," eg. a priest, were omitted from the samples.

Subject Type.

The data in this investigation were collected from samples of six subject populations. The first sample was composed of randomly selected

adults in Peoria, Illinois. These individuals were contacted directly by 18 graduate student interviewers. There were 718 subjects who completed both the peer and spouse scales. The next three samples involved predominately white college students. The second sample was composed of undergraduate students at Illinois State University, 565 of whom completed the peer scales and 564 of whom completed the spouse scales. The third sample included undergraduate students from the University of Utah. There were 178 who completed the peer scales and 172 who completed the spouse scales. Sample 4 was composed of undergraduate students at the University of Southern California, 157 who completed the peer scales and 121 who completed the spouse scales. The fifth sample was composed of black undergraduate students from Hampton Institute. The peer scales were completed by 112 subjects, the spouse scales by 107. The final sample was composed of Japanese students from Nihon University in Tokyo, Japan. There were 52 subjects who completed the peer scales and 50 who completed the spouse scales. All of the student samples were composed of undergraduates enrolled in basic speech or communication classes. The instruments were administered during regular class periods. Since some of the samples included less than 200 subjects, caution must be exercised in interpreting the factor analytic results from these samples.

Data Analysis.

The data from the six samples and two source-types were analyzed separately. The data were submitted to principle components factor analysis and varimax rotation. Unity was inserted in the diagonals and eigenvalue of 1.0 was established as the criterion for termination of factor extraction. For an item to be considered loaded on a resulting factor, a loading of .60 or higher on the factor was required with no loading of .40 or higher on any other factor. For a factor to be considered meaningful, the requirement was set that two scales must have satisfactory loadings on that factor. All data analyses were performed with the cooperation of the Computation Center at Illinois State University.

Where sample size permitted (in excess of 400) the data were divided into two sub-sets and analyzed to determine whether internal replication was possible. The Peoria subjects were randomly assigned to the two subsets. The Illinois State subjects were divided by the sex of the respondent.

The second set of analyses performed on the data were canonical correlation analyses computed between scores on the obtained factors for the sample and the nine measures of potential communication behavior and responses to communication behavior. Each sample was analyzed separately. The .05 level was set for significance of obtained canonical variables.

The third phase of the data analysis employed step-wise multiple regression analyses. Scores were computed for each obtained dimension of credibility for each subject sample based on all of the items with satisfactory factor loadings on the given dimensions. So that the scores on the various dimensions could be placed on the same continuum for comparison, the obtained score for each dimension was divided by the number of items loading on that dimension. These scores were then employed as predictor variables in multiple regression analyses. The criterion variables for the analyses were the measures of potential communication behavior and responses to communication behavior. Each criterion measure was analyzed separately.

The criterion established for termination of the step-wise multiple regression analyses was when an entering variable in the analysis had a nonsignificant ($p < .05$) partial correlation with the criterion variable or when extraction of an additional step would account for less than a one per cent increase in variance accounted for from the analysis.

The first multiple regression analyses conducted were based on the factor structure for the data sample under consideration (e.g. the Peoria factor structure for the Peoria data). Subsequently, analyses were conducted employing the factor structure for other samples on the data under consideration (e.g. the Japan factor structure on the Peoria data.)

RESULTS

Factor Analyses - Peer Data.

Factor analyses of the data provided by the Peoria sample indicated the presence of five factors in each sub-set of the sample. These factors were labeled "Character," "Extroversion," "Competence," "Composure," and "Sociability." These factors accounted for 60 per cent of the total variance of the satisfactorily loaded scales in one subject and 63 per cent in the other. As noted in Table 1, almost perfect replication between the two sub-sets was obtained.

Analysis of the data provided by the Illinois State subjects indicated the presence of four factors. These were essentially the same factors as were obtained from the Peoria data, except that the "Character" and "Sociability" factors collapsed into one factor. These factors accounted for 61 per cent of the total variance of the satisfactorily loaded scales for the male subjects and 58 per cent for the females. (See Table 2)

The results of the factor analysis of the data from the University of Utah indicated a four-factor solution very similar to that obtained from Illinois State. Again the "Character" and "Sociability" dimensions collapsed into one factor. The four factors accounted for 60 per cent of the total variance of the satisfactorily loaded items. (See Table 3)

An examination of the factor analysis results from the Southern California data, once again, indicated the presence of four factors with "Character" and "Sociability" combining to form a single factor. This four-factor solution accounted for 58 per cent of the total variance on the satisfactorily loaded items. (See Table 4)

Analyses of data from Hampton and Japan indicated somewhat different factor structures. The Hampton data yielded a four-factor solution accounting for 55 per cent of the variance. (See Table 5) The "Extroversion" and "Composure" factors observed in previous samples were present. The "Sociability" factor, however, split and combined in part with "Character" and in part with "Competence" to form two new factors. The Japanese data yielded a three-factor solution accounting for 57 per cent of the variance. (See Table 6) The previously observed "Extroversion" and "Sociability" factors were present. The third factor was labeled "General Evaluation" because it appeared to represent a combination of the "Character" and "Competence" factors. "Composure" items neither formed nor contributed to a factor.

A comparison of the results of these analyses suggests the presence of either four or five dimensions of response. "Extroversion" appeared in the analyses for all six samples. "Composure" and "Competence" appeared in five. "Sociability" appeared independently in two samples, in combination with "Character" in three, and split between "Character" and "Competence" in one. "Character" appeared independently in one sample, combined with "Sociability" in four samples, and as a part of a "General Evaluation" factor in one sample. The results of the analyses from the four larger samples (Peoria, ISU, Utah, USC) were quite similar. The results from the Hampton and Japanese samples, however, were quite disparate. This may suggest a cross-cultural difference in response patterns to peer sources. However, the results cannot be interpreted as conclusive since the small sample sizes in these two instances introduce considerable ambiguity.

Table 7 presents suggested scales for the measurement of peer credibility. The scales are categorized by dimension. The scales suggested are those with the most frequent, high loadings on the given dimension. A special comment is needed related to the dimensions labeled "Character," "Sociability," and "Character/Sociability." The scales suggested for the independent "Character" and "Sociability" dimensions can also be used to measure the combined dimension. The scales specifically suggested for the combined dimension are those that were highly loaded on the combined dimension when it emerged and were not clearly associated with either of the separate dimensions when they appeared alone.

Factor Analyses - Spouse Data.

Factor analyses of the data provided by the Peoria sample indicated the presence of five factors in each sub-set of the sample (See Table 8). These factors were labeled "Character," "Extroversion," "Competence," "Composure," and "Sociability." The factors accounted for 60 per cent of the total variance of the satisfactorily loaded scales in one sub-set and 64 per cent in the other. Almost perfect replication between the two subsets was obtained.

The analyses of the data provided by the Illinois State, Hampton, and Japanese subjects (See Tables 9, 12, 13) indicated the presence of the same five dimensions of response observed in the Peoria data. These five factors accounted for 60 per cent of the total variance of the satisfactorily loaded scales for the ISU males, 54 per cent for the ISU females, 57 per cent for the Hampton sample, and 63 per cent for the Japanese sample.

The results of the factor analyses of the data from the Utah and Southern California subjects indicated the presence of four factors (See Tables 10 and 11). "Character" and "Sociability" collapsed into a single factor, while "Extroversion," "Competence," and "Composure" emerged independently. These four factors accounted for 57 per cent of the variance in the Utah sample and 54 per cent in the Southern California sample.

A comparison of the results from these six samples strongly indicates the presence of five dimensions of response to spouse sources. As in the case of peer sources, however, the "Character" and "Sociability" dimensions seem fairly closely associated and can be expected to collapse into a single dimension under some, as yet unexplained, circumstances. Table 14

suggests scales for the measurement of spouse credibility. As in the case of the previously suggested peer scales, scales recommended for the separate Character and Sociability dimensions may also be used to measure the combined dimension.

A comparison of Tables 7 and 14 indicates considerable similarity in both factor structure and best scales to measure those factors between these two types of communication sources. It is quite clear that "Competence," "Extroversion," and "Composure" represent dimensions of response to peer and spouse communication sources for most of the subject samples considered in this investigation. The remaining elements in the structure are less clear. It appears, however, that there is a factor which we have labeled "Character/Sociability," that is very strong, but unstable across subject populations and source types. Whether this factor should be considered a single dimension of response or two separate dimensions is an open question. It appears that some undefined variable (or variables) operates to produce instability in this dimension of response. It remains for later research to probe the cause of this variability. Until that research is completed, we suggest that "Character" and "Sociability" should be measured separately and assumed to be independent factors. Our results indicate that often this assumption will be valid. However, when the assumption is <u>not</u> valid, there will be little lost in the design of the study. At worst the results on the two dimensions will be identical. If, on the other hand, the researcher were to assume a single dimension in a case where two dimensions of response existed, a single score for that dimension could be quite meaningless and lead to false conclusions from the research.

It might be argued that better advice would be to factor analyze every time. We do not accept this suggestion. Our results clearly indicate that under some circumstances (as yet unspecified) "Character" and "Sociability" are independent responses. Consequently, we need to begin to develop theory concerning how these variables affect the communication process and, in turn, how communication behavior affects these responses to sources. Theory concerning a combined "Character/Sociability" dimension may prove as useless in the long run as previous theory concerning the presumed undimensional "Credibility" or "Ethos" construct has become since it has been demonstrated that these constructs are multi-dimensional.

<u>Canonical Correlation Analyses.</u>

Canonical correlation analyses were performed on each data sample in two ways. In the first analysis the predictor variables (credibility factors) were based on the items found to load highly in the factor analysis of that data sample. In the second analysis the predictor variables were based on the generalized scales (See Tables 7 and 14) recommended for use in later studies. Since the results across samples were so highly similar, only the results for the two largest samples, Peoria and Illinois State, will be considered here. Also since the results using the generalized scales and those using predictors based on the sample's best scales generated from factor analysis were so similar, this report will consider only the results based on the generalized scales.

Table 15 reports the results of the analyses based on the peer data. Four significantly correlated canonical variables were obtained for both samples. Table 16 reports the results of the analyses based on the spouse

data. Again, four significantly correlated canonical variables were obtained. In both instances for both samples (as well as for the results not reported for the other samples) all predictors and all criterion variables were significantly correlated with the first canonical variable. These results suggest that the five credibility factors are operating within a single (although multidimensional) system and also that the criterion variables are operating within a single (also multidimensional) system. Moreover, these two systems are highly related to each other. Consequently, even though one credibility dimension may be more useful as a predictor of one criterion variable than another dimension, all five dimensions of credibility should be considered as relevant predictors of all of the criterion variables. To examine this predictive power more closely, a series of multiple regression analyses were conducted.

Multiple Regression Analyses.

The regression analyses provided data with regard to three important questions. The first of these was "Can the dimensions of credibility predict substantial variance in potential communication-related behavior?" The second question was "Do differences in factor structure among six populations affect the ability of source credibility dimensions to predict communication-related behavior?" The final question was "What is the comparative importance of observed credibility dimensions in the prediction of communication-related behavior?"

Although there was a considerable range across criterion variables and subject populations (See Tables 17 and 18) the obtained multiple correlations for the most part ranged from .5 to .7. The answer to our first question, therefore, is a qualified "yes." Dimensions of credibility can predict substantial variance in potential communication-related behavior. This conclusion should be tempered with an awareness that a multiple correlation of .7 still represents predictable variance of less than 50 per cent. Given the nature of the criterion variables employed in this study (single 11-step scales), this probably represents a realistic estimate of variance predictability. The reliability of single scales of this sort is always questionable. With better measures of communication-related behavior, a better answer to this question should be possible. The primary analyses employed the factor structure for the predictor variables that was generated by the same subjects who provided the responses representing the criterion variables. Supplementary analyses used factor structures based on the other data samples. If the source of the factor structure were an important consideration in predicting potential communication-related behavior, we should expect considerable variability in the multiple correlations between predictor and criterion variables when the predictor variables represent factor structures generated by different populations. An examination of the results (not reported in detail here) indicated no such major variability. Rather, roughly equivalent multiple correlations were obtained on all of the criterion variables regardless of which factor structure served as the basis of the predictor variables. The answer to our second question, therefore, appears to be "no." Differences in factor structure among the six populations investigated in this study did not substantially affect the ability of credibility dimensions to predict potential communication-related behavior.

The third important question to which the regression analyses were directed was concerned with the comparitive importance of obtained credibility dimensions in the prediction of potential communication-related behavior. Tables 19-27 report the regression equations obtained for the criterion variables for each sample. An examination of these equations indicates that all of the dimensions of credibility obtained in this study contributed under certain conditions, to the prediction of potential communication-related behavior. However, the three dimensions which most consistently accounted for the most variance were Competence, "Character, and "Sociability."

CONCLUSIONS

The current investigation was designed to investigate the dimensionality of source credibility of peer and spouse sources across diverse subject populations, and to determine the generalizability of any observed factor structure. In addition, the study was designed to generate information concerning the importance of any observed lack of generalizability.

The results of this investigation suggest that researchers should not expect exactly the same dimensionality of source credibility for all subject populations. Substantial differences in factor structures were observed for both source-types. Not only were different dimensions obtained from different populations, but even when similar dimensions appeared for more than one population the scales representing those dimensions were not identical. On the surface these results suggest a severe problem for the development of measures of the credibility of peers and spouses that could be used across a variety of subject populations. However, further examination of the data suggests that such a conclusion is probably unwarranted. The results of the regression analyses indicate that the observed variability in factor structures did not seriously affect the ability of those factor structures to predict the same potential communication-related behavior. Consequently, the scales reported in Tables 7 and 14 are suggested for use across populations. These scales can be expected to tap all of the dimensions observed in the six populations in this study. While in some instances an investigator may obtain more information from these scales than he needs (the behavior which he may wish to predict may not be related to one or more dimensions being measured), the use of these scales ought to provide reasonable assurance that necessary information will be available.

It should be stressed that the scales recommended in Tables 7 and 14 are recommended only for the measurement of the credibility of peers and spouses. Data related to other source types (collected at the same time as the data for the present study) indicates that the use of these scales for other types of sources may be totally inappropriate. It should also be stressed that as extensive as the current investigation was, these results should not be considered representative of all potential subject populations. While there may be comparatively less need for replication research with general American populations, there is clearly a need for research with other sub-cultural populations within the United States and cultures represented in other nations. In addition, there is need for research which employs these or similar credibility scales and obtains

more direct measures of actual (rather than potential) communication-related behavior. This and previous research strongly suggests that source credibility plays a major role in communication behavior. The need now is for research that can express quantitatively the degree of that relationship.

REFERENCES

Baudin, E. S. and Davis, M. K., "Scales for the Measurement of Ethos: Another Attempt," Speech Monographs, 39, 1973, 296-301.

Berlo, D. K., Lemert, J. B., and Mertz, R., "Dimensions for Evaluating the Acceptability of Message Sources," Public Opinion Quarterly, 33, 1969, 563-576.

Cooley, W. W. and Lohnes P. R., Multivariate Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962).

Guilford, J. P., Psychometric Methods (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954).

Markham, D., "The Dimensions of Source Credibility of Television Newscasters," Journal of Communication, 18, 1968, 57-64.

McCroskey, J. C., "Scales for the Measurement of Ethos," Speech Monographs, 33, 1966, 65-72.

McCroskey, J. C., Scott, M. D., and Young, T. J., "The Dimensions of Source Credibility for Spouses and Peers," Paper presented at convention of Western Speech Communication Association, Fresno, California, November, 1971.

Norman, W. T., "Toward an Adequate Taxonomy of Personality Attributes: Replicated Factor Structure in Peer Nomination Personality Ratings," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66, 1963, 574-583.

Tucker, R. K., "On the McCroskey Scales for the Measurement of Ethos," Central States Speech Journal, 22, 1971, 127-129.

Whitehead, J. L., Jr., "Factors of Source Credibility," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 54, 1968, 59-63.

Table 1

Rotated Factor Loadings for Subsets of Peoria Sample-Peer

	Factor									
	Character		Extraversion		Competence		Composure		Sociability	
Scale Subset:	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
intelligent-unintelligent	21	18	-07	00	-72	-77	-02	-01	22	21
sociable-unsociable	22	10	-35	-35	-11	-11	-12	-02	65	71
nervous-poised	-12	-16	13	11	20	18	-77	81	-05	05
cheerful-gloomy	30	25	-22	-14	-11	-13	-23	-13	61	71
tense-relaxed	-22	-21	15	09	08	06	79	85	-08	-12
sinful-virtuous	-60	-60	-09	-12	21	18	00	08	04	10
good natured-irritable	39	34	-08	07	-18	-21	-21	-19	62	65
intellectual-narrow	17	21	-07	04	-68	-72	-10	-09	30	30
dishonest-honest	-71	-75	-03	-06	22	12	03	10	-07	-01
meek-aggressive	-04	-08	74	79	14	10	-05	-02	18	20
selfish-unselfish	-64	-64	-03	-05	13	11	18	18	-21	-23
calm-anxious	02	-01	11	16	-25	-25	-74	-74	20	24
verbal-quiet	-06	-13	-67	-73	-07	-05	13	05	22	28
logical-illogical	29	23	-03	08	-66	-66	-24	-30	25	18
undependable-responsible	-68	-69	00	-03	39	38	10	14	-05	04
untrained-trained	-32	-35	16	21	65	64	19	19	16	22
unsympathetic-sympathetic	-69	-72	10	05	15	16	05	-07	-16	-08
awful-nice	-79	-82	05	00	14	06	09	04	-15	-13
qualified-unqualified	26	24	-11	-16	-73	-74	-11	-11	06	04
extroverted-introverted	-02	-07	-60	-64	-14	-16	-02	-06	34	38
unpleasant-pleasant	-71	-71	13	05	06	02	18	19	-32	-32
timid-bold	04	01	76	83	09	05	07	15	17	13
good-bad	66	62	00	12	-29	-27	06	04	26	27
repulsive-attractive	-65	-68	20	15	15	17	04	04	-09	-01
cruel-kind	-82	-81	08	04	13	09	08	08	-12	-19
talkative-silent	09	01	-68	-74	01	00	10	07	25	31
expert-inexpert	10	12	-25	-24	-75	-76	-16	-07	01	01
Eigenvalue	5.58	5.62	2.82	3.20	3.59	3.64	2.15	2.29	2.03	2.40
Percentage of Variance	21	21	10	12	13	13	08	08	08	09

Table 2

Rotated Factor Loadings for Male and Female Subjects in Illinois State Sample-Peer

	Factor							
	Character/ Sociability		Extroversion		Composure		Competence	
Scale / Sex.	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
intelligent-unintelligent	35	24	-08	-03	-20	-11	-61	-66
nervous-poised	-06	-13	15	22	77	76	13	14
tense-relaxed	-22	-18	26	23	66	75	-03	06
good-natured-irritable	70	75	-22	-17	-17	-19	-02	-02
cooperative-negativistic	74	66	-10	-05	-23	-22	-02	-17
outgoing-withdrawn	25	21	-73	-77	-09	-14	00	-03
meek-aggressive	05	14	71	64	-07	00	28	04
selfish-unselfish	-73	-66	10	03	09	10	10	-04
calm-anxious	24	10	10	04	-70	-76	-05	-22
verbal-quiet	-07	-05	-78	-75	-08	00	02	-07
untrained-trained	-11	-19	21	13	14	14	78	71
unsympathetic-sympathetic	-76	-67	-01	-01	03	-02	08	09
awful-nice	-85	-75	-03	08	04	00	12	09
qualified-unqualified	23	20	-15	-12	-04	-13	-83	-77
just-unjust	76	71	-05	03	08	-09	-36	-23
unpleasant-pleasant	-73	-76	18	11	18	-01	09	14
timid-bold	11	18	72	75	03	09	22	00
good-bad	76	74	00	09	-04	01	-24	-31
composed-excitable	05	-08	26	24	-62	-67	07	-11
cruel-kind	-81	-84	-06	03	12	03	08	14
talkative-silent	01	04	-75	-78	04	10	18	-05
expert-inexpert	25	14	-31	-10	05	-14	-74	-75
passive-active	-08	-19	61	63	00	-11	35	15
Eigenvalue	5.67	5.12	3.53	3.40	2.13	2.39	2.76	2.45
Percent of Variance	25	22	15	15	09	10	12	11

Table 4

Rotated Factor Loadings for Southern California Sample-Peer

Scale	Factor: Character/ Sociability	Extroversion	Composure	Competence
nervous--poised	-08	-15	-72	-23
tense--relaxed	00	-07	-81	-13
sinful--virtuous	-67	23	00	11
believable--unbelievable	65	00	07	35
intellectual-narrow	33	08	04	64
cooperative-negativistic	61	08	22	33
outgoing-withdrawn	10	77	28	15
dishonest-honest	-70	-03	-19	-03
meek aggressive	17	-69	03	-22
calm--anxious	26	--14	63	10
verbal-quiet	06	77	-10	-04
undependable-responsible	-67	-01	-01	-17
unsympathetic--sympathetic	-72	-10	--10	00
admirable-contemptible	71	07	03	34
awful-nice	-80	-03	00	-11
extroverted-introverted	16	72	04	10
unpleasant-pleasant	-69	--14	--18	-31
timid-bold	22	-75	-13	-27
energetic-tired	32	71	--06	17
good-bad	69	13	09	26
repulsive-attractive	-60	-23	-14	--37
uninformed--informed	-23	-17	--24	-64
cruel-kind	-73	--09	-19	-11
talkative-silent	07	78	-02	00
expert-inexpert	20	10	10	76
passive--active	-15	-72	00	-16
reliable-unreliable	67	13	-09	19
Eigenvalue	6.65	4.66	1.96	2.44
Percent of Variance	25	17	07	09

Table 3

Rotated Factor Loadings for Utah Sample-Peer

Scale	Character/ Sociability	Factor Extroversion	Competence	Composure
intelligent-unintelligent	26	09	73	02
sinful-virtuous	-69	05	-09	-08
intellectual-narrow	30	01	73	11
outgoing-withdrawn	21	76	17	03
dishonest-honest	-79	02	-08	15
calm-anxious	18	11	11	75
inexperienced-experienced	-05	-23	-60	-13
verbal-quiet	07	81	-01	-12
unsympathetic-sympathetic	-70	-12	-23	-01
admirable-contemptible	70	12	24	00
awful-nice	-79	-09	-19	-14
qualified-unqualified	31	09	64	-09
extroverted-introverted	06	79	03	07
just-unjust	61	13	38	08
unpleasant-pleasant	-66	-33	-28	-22
timid-bold	10	-67	-23	-12
good-bad	80	-01	25	08
repulsive-attractive	-64	-24	-24	-13
uninformed-informed	-23	01	-71	-03
composed-excitable	08	-08	06	79
cruel-kind	-74	-05	-39	-04
talkative-silent	01	82	06	-04
expert-inexpert	14	18	63	07
crude-refined	-62	-01	-12	-34
Eigenvalue	5.92	3.32	3.51	1.51
Percent of Variance	25	14	15	06

Table 5

Rotated Factor Loadings for Hampton Sample-Peer

Scale	Factor			
	Character/ Sociability	Extroversion	Composure	Competence/ Sociability
intelligent-unintelligent	33	-01	-10	61
sociable-unsociable	10	33	-16	66
nervous--poised	--17	-06	78	-10
cheerful-gloomy	13	11	-26	71
tense-relaxed	--29	04	69	04
intellectual-narrow	39	10	-21	65
dishonest-honest	-63	16	20	-21
verbal-quiet	--10	60	19	10
logical--illogical	30	06	-20	69
undependable--responsible	--80	-08	06	-12
confident--lacks confidence	01	30	-61	31
unsympathetic-sympathetic	-71	--08	--01	-15
admirable-conterptable	64	19	-19	20
awful-nice	-68	--04	20	--22
just--unjust	64	--01	--04	25
timid-bold	05	-71	38	07
energetic--tired	33	63	03	--04
good-bad	74	04	-12	16
repulsive-attractive	-65	-04	-09	11
cruel-kind	-67	05	13	--29
talkative-silent	-01	64	01	18
passive-active	--23	--71	--04	-07
crude-refined	-62	18	24	--09
Eigenvalue	5.29	2.52	2.05	2.73
Percent of Variance	23	11	09	12

Table 6

Rotated Factor Loadings for Japan Sample-Peer

Scale	Factor: General Evaluation	Extroversion	Sociability
sociable-unsociable	-09	80	22
believable-unbelievable	69	-02	24
good-natured-irritable	35	04	64
outgoing withdrawn	00	75	39
dishonest-honest	-71	19	-34
meek-aggressive	02	-70	06
valuable-worthless	72	35	11
logical-illogical	75	05	05
undependable-responsible	-74	-16	-10
friendly-unfriendly	11	15	71
confident-lacks confidence	11	74	03
awful-nice	-18	-17	-67
extroverted-introverted	15	67	-16
unpleasant-pleasant	-25	-16	-68
timid-bold	-28	-63	-22
energetic-tired	20	70	14
passive-active	-03	-75	-25
reliable-unreliable	78	-04	04
Eigenvalue	3.61	4.41	2.39
Percent of Variance	20	24	13

Table 7

Suggested Scales for the Measurement of Peer Credibility

Dimension	Scales
Competence	expert-inexpert, intelligent-unintelligent, intellectual-narrow, qualified-unqualified, logical-illogical, untrained-trained, uninformed-informed
Character	dishonest-honest, unsympathetic-sympathetic, good-bad, cruel-kind, undependable-responsible, repulsive-attractive, sinful-virtuous
Sociability	good-natured-irritable, cheerful-gloomy, sociable-unsociable, friendly-unfriendly
Composure	nervous-poised, tense-relaxed, calm-anxious, composed-excitable
Extroversion	timid-bold, verbal-quiet, talkative-silent, meek-aggressive, extroverted-introverted, outgoing-withdrawn, passive-active, energetic-tired
Character/Sociability	awful-nice, unpleasant-pleasant, admirable-contemptible, just-unjust, cooperative-negativistic, crude-refined

Table 8

Rotated Factor Loadings for Subsets of Peoria Sample

	Factor									
	Character		Extroversion		Competence		Composure		Sociability	
Scale Subset	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
intelligent--unintelligent	17	14	06	-05	70	71	04	04	22	21
sociable--unsociable	13	17	33	39	22	22	-05	-04	67	61
nervous-poised	-36	-21	-18	-06	-02	-06	71	82	-04	-01
cheerful-gloomy	22	28	03	19	27	28	-17	-18	69	67
tense-relaxed	-24	-18	-02	-04	09	10	77	85	-13	-04
good natured-irritable	28	31	-12	10	17	29	-22	-15	70	70
intellectual-narrow	21	20	-02	00	69	75	-03	00	36	22
dishonest-honest	-65	-70	01	14	-18	-15	09	-03	07	-14
calm-anxious	-08	-05	-17	-12	31	23	-69	-73	22	19
verbal-quiet	-11	-07	69	67	-04	07	22	16	19	02
logical illogical	24	26	05	-05	70	67	-22	-19	22	18
undependable--responsible	-69	-67	-13	08	-25	-26	21	14	04	03
friendly-unfriendly	27	23	14	36	11	20	-11	-04	68	65
unsympathetic-sympathetic	-69	-74	02	-13	-01	-13	-03	02	-33	-03
awful-nice	-82	-78	-01	07	-07	-12	06	08	-16	-26
qualified-unqualified	25	24	00	13	68	66	-13	-12	07	16
extroverted-introverted	-09	-04	64	78	09	-03	-11	-05	36	06
unpleasant-pleasant	-72	-79	-02	-12	-16	-06	06	09	-32	-37
repulsive--attractive	-67	-74	-06	-02	-14	-02	05	07	-11	-15
composed-excitable	-04	-09	-09	-22	29	39	-66	-61	14	11
cruel-kind	-78	-81	03	-02	-12	-18	06	04	-29	-20
talkative-silent	-08	-02	61	72	-07	01	28	16	34	21
expert-inexpert	10	19	11	39	78	61	-12	-24	07	-26
crude--refined	-60	-71	13	-08	-24	-26	08	07	-16	04
Eigenvalue	4.62	5.00	1.53	2.21	3.11	2.02	2.39	2.57	2.85	2.34
Percent of Variance	19	21	06	09	13	13	10	11	12	10

Table 9

Rotated Factor Loadings for Male and Female subjects in Illinois State Sample

	Factor									
	Sociability		Extroversion		Competence		Composure		Character	
Scale / Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
nervous-poised	-03	-09	34	30	16	12	69	70	15	14
cheerful gloomy	66	65	-06	-20	01	-02	-01	-20	-09	-10
tense-relaxed	-27	-18	15	19	18	13	66	71	-03	08
sinful-virtuous	-12	-12	-09	-07	-06	-08	06	15	74	65
good-natured-irritable	71	66	-15	-11	-04	-12	-18	-20	17	23
dishonest-honest	-16	-21	04	-03	17	08	07	-02	75	66
meek-aggressive	11	22	69	61	21	26	-06	-01	-16	-04
calm-anxious	18	12	-03	-07	-06	-16	-74	-74	-07	-03
verbal-quiet	-03	04	-75	-72	00	-01	-08	-09	-16	01
undependable-responsible	-30	-24	00	02	38	25	-01	04	63	71
friendly-unfriendly	78	63	-15	-36	-05	00	-13	-21	-08	-04
untrained-trained	-17	-14	13	15	75	61	-02	13	-03	05
awful-nice	-78	-63	-03	05	26	27	09	01	01	18
qualified-unqualified	17	30	-09	-11	-73	-65	-13	-08	-13	-13
extroverted-introverted	16	11	-65	-62	01	00	-26	-27	01	01
unpleasant-pleasant	-67	-74	01	11	34	28	06	08	17	15
timid-bold	-01	09	73	74	13	22	-07	07	-20	-03
uninformed-informed	-21	-16	10	07	63	63	28	13	00	06
composed-excitable	01	-05	18	17	-10	-19	-69	-61	00	-07
cruel-kind	-70	-62	00	-03	18	21	15	03	27	37
talkative-silent	23	14	-72	-72	03	03	-19	-05	-07	-01
expert-inexpert	04	09	-15	-13	-73	-68	-17	-14	-14	-13
reliable-unreliable	39	26	00	-01	38	-25	02	-04	-61	-70
Eigenvalue	3.68	3.06	2.8	2.76	2.70	2.21	2.27	2.22	2.19	2.18
Percent of Variance	16	13	12	12	12	10	10	10	10	09

Table 10

Rotated Factor Loadings for Utah Sample

Scale	Factor			
	Character/ Sociability	Competence	Extroversion	Composure
nervous-poised	06	-32	-07	74
cheerful-gloomy	62	-23	36	-24
tense-relaxed	-18	00	-21	81
sinful-virtuous	-62	-16	18	-05
good-natured-irritable	77	-08	13	-25
cooperative-negativistic	64	17	03	-11
outgoing-withdrawn	22	05	72	-24
dishonest-honest	-74	-17	06	04
selfish-unselfish	-73	-03	07	08
calm-anxious	10	17	01	-69
verbal quiet	-17	11	75	-01
logical-illogical	19	61	00	-29
friendly-unfriendly	75	-13	22	-12
untrained-trained	04	-74	-16	01
unsympathetic-sympathetic	-72	-13	05	-02
awful nice	-77	-10	04	01
qualified-unqualified	13	78	22	00
extroverted-introverted	06	08	73	-13
unpleasant-pleasant	-82	07	-15	07
timid-bold	17	-30	-63	00
good-bad	67	32	-13	04
repulsive-attractive	-72	10	-06	-04
uninformed-informed	-11	-79	-08	18
incompetent-competent	-29	-73	-11	13
cruel-kind	-83	-09	04	07
talkative-silent	-04	12	78	11
expert-inexpert	-14	73	19	-03
passive-active	10	-35	-64	00
Eigenvalue	7.19	4.04	2.93	1.97
Percent of Variance	26	14	10	07

Table 11

Rotated Factor Loadings for USC Sample

Scale	Factor			
	Character/ Sociability	Extroversion	Competence	Composure
intelligent--unintelligent	-03	07	63	09
nervous--poised	05	-15	-18	-74
tense--relaxed	-02	-19	-08	-72
good-natured--irritable	65	18	-12	29
intellectual--narrow	12	-11	63	13
cooperative--negativistic	64	25	-12	15
outgoing--withdrawn	10	80	09	06
calm--anxious	08	-01	07	74
verbal--quiet	-15	74	07	-03
undependable--responsible	-61	10	-27	-03
unsympathetic--sympathetic	-61	-15	04	13
admirable--contemptible	61	29	24	-02
awful--nice	-75	-21	-04	00
extroverted--introverted	-07	67	06	-04
just--unjust	70	-02	19	12
unpleasant--pleasant	-78	-13	-05	04
timid--bold	14	-68	-34	14
good--bad	76	03	17	-19
uninformed--informed	-05	-28	-60	-01
composed--excitable	-07	-25	09	60
cruel--kind	-83	-06	02	-06
talkative--silent	10	73	-10	-11
expert--inexpert	04	23	69	05
reliable--unreliable	70	01	13	-09
Eigenvalue	5.47	3.18	2.07	2.23
Percent of Variance	23	13	09	09

Table 12

Rotated Factor Loadings for Hampton Sample

Scale	Factor				
	Character	Extroversion	Competence	Sociability	Composure
intelligent-unintelligent	.18	-02	67	26	03
sociable-unsociable	04	35	22	67	09
nervous-poised	00	-18	-24	-09	-76
cheerful-gloomy	22	12	21	69	09
tense-relaxed	-05	-04	03	-11	-89
good natured-irritable	37	13	26	64	17
intellectual-narrow	16	-08	70	36	-02
outgoing-withdrawn	06	70	05	32	-08
dishonest-honest	-78	02	-21	-01	04
meek-aggressive	03	-64	-04	20	-12
valuable-worthless	67	24	33	09	02
selfish-unselfish	-68	16	-11	-18	-27
verbal-quiet	06	76	-14	01	-04
undependable-responsible	74	06	-33	06	-07
untrained-trained	-11	07	-66	-01	-05
admirable-contemptible	22	00	61	18	11
unqualified-unqualified	27	15	66	09	09
extroverted-introverted	-17	65	-10	24	13
just-unjust	69	03	20	26	16
unpleasant-pleasant	-66	-07	-17	-29	-03
timid-bold	17	-63	-17	29	-02
good-bad	78	09	07	12	09
repulsive-attractive	-86	-12	-29	-03	00
talkative-silent	06	79	-03	06	-03
expert-inexpert	02	03	60	13	15
crude-refined	-62	-04	-22	-04	01
reliable-unreliable	61	-05	36	22	14
Eigenvalue	4.89	3.26	3.43	2.16	1.64
Percent of Variance	18	12	13	08	06

Table 13

Rotated Factor Loadings for Japanese Sample

Scale	Factor				
	Competence	Character	Composure	Sociability	Extroversion
nervous-poised	-.17	-.36	-.73	-.34	-.07
cheerful-gloomy	.28	.36	00	.75	.27
tense-relaxed	-.02	.05	-.85	-.01	.00
good-natured-irritable	.24	.09	.26	.73	.00
intellectual-narrow	.63	.10	-.07	.38	-.15
outgoing-withdrawn	.12	.05	.02	.36	.61
calm-anxious	.00	.12	.65	.01	-.24
verbal-quiet	.02	.33	.04	-.10	.61
friendly-unfriendly	-.06	.22	.07	.81	.19
untrained-trained	-.72	.23	.13	-.22	.12
admirable-contemptible	.24	.64	-.09	.21	-.18
extroverted-introverted	.22	.00	-.19	.10	.68
unpleasant-pleasant	-.08	-.21	-.25	.71	-.16
good-bad	.10	.74	.12	.25	.03
incompetent-competent	-.62	.20	.07	-.12	-.15
talkative-silent	-.02	.23	.19	-.15	.72
expert-inexpert	.74	.31	.11	.23	.11
impressive-unimpressive	.69	.18	.29	.13	.13
reliable-unreliable	.13	.72	-.18	.13	.24
Eigenvalue	2.65	2.25	2.06	2.94	2.10
Percent of Variance	14	12	11	15	11

Table 14

Suggested Scales for the Measurement of Spouse Credibility

Dimension	Scales
Competence	Expert-inexpert, untrained--trained, qualified-unqualified, intellectual-narrow, uninformed-informed, intelligent-unintelligent
Extroversion	verbal-quiet, extroverted--introverted, talkative-silent, outgoing-withdrawn, timid-bold, meek--aggressive
Composure	nervous-poised, tense-relaxed, calm-anxious, composed--excitable
Sociability	cheerful-gloomy, good-natured-irritable, friendly-unfriendly, sociable-unsociable
Character	reliable-unreliable, dishonest-honest, undependable--responsible, good-bad, crude-refined
Character/Sociability	unpleasant--pleasant, awful-nice, cruel-kind, cooperative-negativistic

Table 15

Canonical Correlation Results--Peer Sources

Correlations with Canonical Variables								
Variable Number	1		2		3		4	
Sample	Peoria	ISU	Peoria	ISU	Peoria	ISU	Peoria	ISU
Credibility Factor								
Competence	.97	.80	.23	.55	-.01*	-.17	.00*	-.18
Extroversion	.42	.37	-.19	-.09	.85	.57	-.14	-.69
Composure	.46	.31	.18	.46	-.09	.22	.62	.40
Character	.73	.79	-.48	-.27	-.30	-.49	-.26	.11
Sociability	.61	.86	-.62	-.28	.21	.39	.44	.15
Criterion Item								
Information	.88	.76	.30	.42	-.16	-.37	-.21	-.18
Decision	.82	.76	.22	.23	-.20	-.25	-.09	.01*
Communicator	.80	.73	-.16	.13	.53	.35	.12	-.53
Interaction	.52	.67	-.34	-.36	.06*	-.24	-.13	-.16
Opinion	.57	.58	.18	.18	-.19	-.28	.08	-.08*
Behavior	.41	.43	.01*	.03*	-.18	-.52	.00*	-.29
Belief	.41	.51	.24	.23	-.12	-.26	.18	-.06*
Like	.64	.85	-.68	-.45	-.26	-.22	-.14	.03*
Work	.69	.84	-.32	-.10	-.30	.04*	.50	.30
Canonical Correlation	.73	.74	.49	.47	.32	.34	.18	.28
Chi-Square	823.43	709.31	289.16	265.70	100.66	126.45	24.93	58.13

*Not significantly correlated with canonical variable

Table 16

Canonical Correlation Results--Spouse Sources

Correlations with Canonical Variables								
Variable Number	1		2		3		4	
Sample	Peoria	ISU	Peoria	ISU	Peoria	ISU	Peoria	ISU
Credibility Factor								
Competence	.96	.91	-.21	-.07*	-.02*	-.29	-.05*	.25
Extroversion	.24	.43	.34	.86	-.86	-.02*	.29	-.26
Composure	.41	.45	.04*	.20	.44	.09	.80	.40
Character	.73	.69	.27	-.47	.20	.01*	-.14	-.49
Sociability	.59	.68	.74	.15	.08	.72	.00*	-.05*
Criterion Item								
Information	.94	.86	-.24	-.27	.11	-.29	-.13	.11
Decision	.60	.77	.07*	-.34	.06*	-.08*	.23	-.40
Communicator	.73	.81	.43	.55	-.38	-.06*	.02*	-.05*
Interaction	.46	.67	.31	-.02*	.07*	.20	.20	-.15
Opinion	.51	.63	-.06*	-.08*	.02*	-.22	.16	.24
Behavior	.34	.49	-.03*	-.04*	.02*	-.27	.12	-.18
Belief	.31	.46	.01*	-.17	.39	-.21	.50	.19
Like	.32	.66	.24	-.17	.08	.33	-.12	-.30
Work	.50	.66	.42	-.13	.63	.64	-.12	.21
Canonical Correlation	.69	.74	.39	.45	.24	.32	.14	.18
Chi-Square	628.24	641.37	179.07	205.72	65.16	81.99	22.61	23.19

*Not significantly correlated with canonical variable

Table 17

Multiple Correlations of Credibility Dimensions With Criterion Variables--Peer Sources

Sample	Criterion Variable								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Peoria	65	60	60	51	50	51	51	58	54
Illinois State	58	58	57	54	46	55	50	67	63
Utah	67	59	62	50	49	55	44	58	55
Southern California	63	62	64	44	43	49	48	63	63
Hampton	51	63	51	53	46	50	52	59	64
Japan	55	51	52	58	45	48	54	55	58

Table 18

Multiple Correlations of Credibility Dimensions With Criterion Variables--Spouse Sources

Sample	Criterion Variable								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Peoria	65	57	53	55	44	52	52	59	51
Illinois State	55	55	60	56	53	56	51	57	53
Utah	64	52	64	70	51	47	50	73	51
Southern California	62	54	59	54	48	49	49	59	54
Hampton	66	58	59	55	51	56	52	56	50
Japan	52	49	49	48	52	41	47	48	47

Table 19

Beta Weights for Criterion Variable 1:
When I need information on an issue, I consider this source as a source of information to be: Moderately--Extremely Valuable.

		Credibility Dimension					
Sample	Constant	Competence	Extroversion	Composure	Character	Sociability	Other
Peoria							
Peer	-.83	1.31	---	---	.24	---	---
Spouse	-.43	1.31	---	---	.24	---	---
Ill. State							
Peer	-1.04	.94	---	---	---	---	.67a
Spouse	-.05	.71	---	---	.46	.31	
Utah							
Peer	-.29	1.14	-.28	---	---	---	.65a
Spouse	-2.22	1.20	---	.21	---	---	.52a
So. Calif.							
Peer	-.66	1.21	---	---	---	---	.38a
Spouse	-4.64	1.52	---	-.15	---	---	.51a
Hampton							
Peer	.49	.79c	---	-.18	---	---	.68a
Spouse	-6.31	1.03	---	.18	.48	.55	---
Japan							
Peer	4.54	---	.74	---	---	-.44	.39b
Spouse	4.61	---	.75	.14	---	---	---

a Character/Sociability b General Evaluation c Competence/Sociability

Table 20

Beta Weights for Criterion Variable 2:

"When I am faced with making a decision, I consider this source's opinions to be: Worthless--Extremely Valuable."

	Credibility Variable						
Sample	Constant	Competence	Extroversion	Composure	Character	Sociability	Other
Peoria							
Peer	-.59	1.21	---	---	.28	---	---
Spouse	1.11	.82	---	---	.57	---	---
Ill. State							
Peer	-2.03	.83	---	---	---	---	.89a
Spouse	.22	.50	---	---	.62	.39	---
Utah							
Peer	-.52	.43	---	---	---	---	1.12a
Spouse	.51	.72	---	---	---	---	.76a
So. Calif.							
Peer	-1.72	.86	---	---	---	---	.81a
Spouse	-5.03	.85	---	-.18	---	---	1.03a
Hampton							
Peer	.34	---	---	---	---	---	1.33a
Spouse	-6.02	.62	---	.21	.81	.41	---
Japan							
Peer	5.87	---	.84	---	---	-.55	---
Spouse	5.50	---	.60	.33	---	-.22	---

a Character/Sociability

Table 21

Beta Weights for Criterion Variable 3:

"As a communicator, I consider this source to be: Inferior--Superior."

	Credibility Variable						
Sample	Constant	Competence	Extroversion	Composure	Character	Sociability	Other
Peoria							
Peer	-1.66	.76	.28	---	.38	.35	---
Spouse	-.72	.57	---	---	.57	.39	---
Ill. State							
Peer	-1.54	.63	.53	---	---	---	.59a
Spouse	-1.01	.64	.58	---	---	.50	---
Utah							
Peer	-.02	.47	.50	---	---	---	.57a
Spouse	1.02	.57	---	.22	---	---	.92a
So. Calif.							
Peer	-1.54	.62	.37	.24	---	---	.56a
Spouse	-5.26	.83	.52	---	---	---	.66a
Hampton							
Peer	.13	.81c	.32	---	---	---	.31a
Spouse	-2.59	.89	.50	---	---	.50	---
Japan							
Peer	3.37	---	.55	---	---	-.30	.56b
Spouse	5.58	-.19	.80	---	---	---	---

a Character/Sociability b General Evaluation c Competence/Sociability

Table 22

Beta Weights for Criterion Variable 4

"I seek opportunities to communicate with this source: Not at all-Very often."

	Credibility Variable						
Sample	Constant	Competence	Extroversion	Composure	Character	Sociability	Other
Peoria							
Peer	.15	.36	----	----	.55	.36	----
Spouse	.33	.34	----	.12	.77	.31	----
Ill. State							
Peer	-.86	----	.30	-.17	----	----	1.37a
Spouse	1.38	.41	.20	----	.29	.54	----
Utah							
Peer	.89	.66	----	----	----	----	.71a
Spouse	.46	-.42	-.21	----	----	----	2.07a
So. Calif.							
Peer	1.69	.39	----	----	----	----	.76a
Spouse	-4.39	.24	----	-.16	----	----	1.37a
Hampton							
Peer	-.44	.49c	.33	-.41	----	----	1.07a
Spouse	-2.01	.63	.26	.13	.59	----	----
Japan							
Peer	3.75	----	.93	----	----	-.59	.43b
Spouse	5.71	----	.51	----	----	----	----

a Character/Sociability b General Evaluation c Competence/Sociability

Table 23

Beta Weights for Criterion Variable 5

"If this source asked you to change your opinion on something, how likely would you be to do so? Very Unlikely-Very Likely."

	Credibility Variable						
Sample	Constant	Competence	Extroversion	Composure	Character	Sociability	Other
Peoria							
Peer	.46	.99	----	----	----	----	----
Spouse	1.63	.72	----	----	.26	----	----
Ill. State							
Peer	-1.81	.69	----	----	----	----	.70a
Spouse	.59	.73	----	.24	.31	----	----
Utah							
Peer	-1.24	.87	----	.17	----	----	.41a
Spouse	-1.27	.36	-.27	.23	----	----	1.17a
So. Calif.							
Peer	-.84	.72	----	.19	----	----	.34a
Spouse	.91	.73	----	-.26	----	----	.34a
Hampton							
Peer	-.34	.87b	----	-.42	----	----	.63a
Spouse	-2.98	1.09	----	----	----	.61	----
Japan							
Peer	2.23	----	.74	----	----	----	----
Spouse	6.64	-.54	.51	.18	----	----	----

a Character/Sociability b Competence/Sociability

Table 24

Beta Weights for Criterion Variable 6

"If this source asked you to do something you had not done before how likely would you be to do so? Very Unlikely--Very Likely."

	Credibility Variable						
Sample	Constant	Competence	Extroversion	Composure	Character	Sociability	Other
Peoria							
Peer	1.64	.53	---	---	.35	---	---
Spouse	2.76	.34	---	---	.57	---	---
Ill. State							
Peer	.15	.56	---	---	---	---	.57a
Spouse	1.62	.42	.19	---	.53	---	---
Utah							
Peer	-.25	---	---	.31	---	---	1.09a
Spouse	.13	---	---	---	---	---	1.31a
So. Calif.							
Peer	-2.11	.64	.28	.23	---	---	.53a
Spouse	2.56	.38	---	-.42	---	---	.59a
Hampton							
Peer	.40	.65c	---	-.31	---	---	.60a
Spouse	-4.73	.63	-.21	.39	.58	.48	---
Japan							
Peer	.84	---	.55	---	---	.57	-.23b
Spouse	8.22	-.75	---	.71	-.55	.32	---

a Character/Sociability b General Evaluation c Competence/Sociability

Table 25

Beta Weights for Criterion Variable 7

"If this source said something was false that you believed was true, how likely would you be to change your mind? Very Unlikely-Very Likely."

	Credibility Variable						
Sample	Constant	Competence	Extroversion	Composure	Character	Sociability	Other
Peoria							
Peer	.65	.77	---	---	---	---	---
Spouse	1.96	.45	---	.22	---	---	---
Ill. State							
Peer	-1.99	.70	---	---	---	---	.56a
Spouse	.07	.55	---	.18	.30	---	---
Utah							
Peer	-1.57	.48	---	.37	---	---	.48a
Spouse	-2.52	.75	-.48	.36	---	---	.88a
So. Calif.							
Peer	-.79	.56	---	.18	---	---	.39a
Spouse	4.10	1.29	---	-.31	---	---	-.46a
Hampton							
Peer	2.06	---	.40	-.28	---	---	.39a
Spouse	-1.34	---	---	---	---	1.10	---
Japan							
Peer	3.81	---	.28	---	---	---	---
Spouse	3.06	---	-.27	1.05	.23	-.35	---

a Character/Sociability

Table 26

Beta Weights for Criterion Variable 8

"How well do you like this source? Very Little-Very Much."

		Credibility Variable					
Sample	Constant	Competence	Extroversion	Composure	Character	Sociability	Other
Peoria							
Peer	.85	1.01	---	---	---	.39	---
Spouse	4.56	.16	---	---	.66	.14	---
Ill. State							
Peer	-.13	---	.25	-.14	---	---	1.45a
Spouse	3.56	.32	---	---	.29	.51	---
Utah							
Peer	2.20	.36	---	---	---	---	.90a
Spouse	2.22	-.33	---	---	---	---	1.60a
So. Calif.							
Peer	.23	.50	---	---	---	---	1.01a
Spouse	2.29	---	---	-.15	---	---	.90a
Hampton							
Peer	.65	.34c	---	.16	---	---	1.27a
Spouse	1.19	.58	.30	---	.39	---	---
Japan							
Peer	1.29	---	.18	---	---	.45	.43b
Spouse	3.06	---	.88	.30	---	---	---

a Character/Sociability b General Evaluation c Competence/Sociability

Table 27

Beta Weights for Criterion Variable 9

"How well would you like to work with this source? Very Little-Very Much."

		Credibility Variable					
Sample	Constant	Competence	Extroversion	Composure	Character	Sociability	Other
Peoria							
Peer	1.54	.54	---	---	.75	.43	---
Spouse	.33	.46	-.18	---	.74	.33	---
Ill. State							
Peer	-2.81	.28	.21	.16	---	---	1.38a
Spouse	-.26	.42	---	.17	---	1.05	---
Utah							
Peer	-.08	.65	---	---	---	---	.95a
Spouse	1.30	---	---	.32	---	---	1.47a
So. Calif.							
Peer	-1.10	.76	-.35	.43	---	---	.90a
Spouse	-5.66	.58	---	---	---	---	1.17a
Hampton							
Peer	-1.74	1.10c	---	---	---	---	.73a
Spouse	-1.92	.94	---	.21	.42	---	---
Japan							
Peer	2.48	---	.50	---	---	.28	.63b
Spouse	6.06	.68	---	.32	-.65	---	---

a Character/Sociability b General Evaluation c Competence/Sociability

APPENDIX A

Semantic Differential Scales

Intelligent-Unintelligent
Valuable-Unvaluable
Virtuous-Biased
Cheerful-Gloomy
Tense-Relaxed
Sinful-Virtuous
Believable-Unbelievable
Good natured-Irritable
Intellectual-Narrow
Cooperative-Negativistic
Outgoing-Withdrawn
Dishonest-Honest
Meek-Aggressive
Valuable-Worthless
Selfish-Unselfish
Calm-Anxious
Inexperienced-Experienced
Verbal-Quiet
Logical-Illogical
Undependable-Responsible
Headstrong-Mild
Friendly-Unfriendly
Confident-Lacks confidence
Untrained-Trained
Unsympathetic-Sympathetic
Admirable-Contemptable
Awful-Nice
Qualified-Unqualified
Extroverted-Introverted
Just-Unjust
Unpleasant-Pleasant
Timid-Bold
Energetic-Tired
Good-Bad
Repulsive-Attractive
Uninformed-Informed
Composed-Excitable
Incompetent-Competent
Cruel-Kind
Talkative-Silent
Expert-Inexpert
Passive-Active
Impressive-Unimpressive
Adventurous-Cautious
Crude-Refined
Reliable-Unreliable

Scales Dropped After Pilot Study

Unimaginative-Imaginative
Irrational-Rational
Consistent-Inconsistent
Jealous-Not jealous
Original-Unoriginal
Artistically sensitive-Artistically Insensitive
Scrupulous-Unscrupulous
Persevering-Fickle
Careless-Tidy
Secretive-Open
Biased-Unbiased

Scales Added After Pilot Study

Tense-Relaxed
Outgoing-Withdrawn
Verbal-Quiet
Confident-Lacks confidence

Potential Communication-Related Behavior Scales

1. When I need information on an issue, I consider this source as a source of information to be.
   Worthless--Extremely Valuable

2. When I am faced with making a decision, I consider this source's opinions to be:
   Worthless--Extremely Valuable

3. As a communicator, I consider this source to be:
   Inferior--Superior

4. I seek opportunities to communicate with this source
   Not at all--Very often

5. If this source asked you to change your opinion on something, how likely would you be to do so?
   Very Unlikely--Very Likely

6. If this source asked you to do something you had not done before, how likely would you be to do so?
   Very Unlikely--Very Likely

7. If this source said something was false that you believed was true, how likely would you be to change your mind?
   Very Unlikely--Very Likely

8. How well do you like this source? Very Little--Very Much

9. How well would you like to work with this source?
   Very Little--Very Much